

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1. Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 21-24, 26, 28-29, 31-33, 35-38 and 40 and claims 27, 30, 34, 39 and 41-42 have been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 21-26, 28-29, 31-33, 35-38 and 40 are pending in the application. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §101

The Examiner rejected claim 40 on the asserted basis that those claims are directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claim 40 has been amended to direct it to statutory subject matter.

3. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112

The Examiner objected to claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Support for this claim can be found at least at page 3, lines 16-23.

Claims 22 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter as the invention. Claim 42 has been canceled rendering the rejection of that claim moot. Claim 22 has been amended to overcome the objection.

4. Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 21-25, 40 and 42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herpel (European Patent Application 1 045 386) in view of Tadayon (United States Patent 7,222,104) with Request for Comment 2616 ("HTTP") and Request for Comment 793 ("TCP") as supporting evidence.

Claim 42 has been canceled rendering the rejection of that claim moot. Independent claims 21, 22 and 40 have been amended to include the limitation of integrating a media file history log into each media file that identifies at least one of previous owners and transfers of the media file, the media file being synchronized with the media file history log with the logged transfers stored within the central interface unit. None of the cited references disclose this limitation.

Claims 26-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herpel in view of Tadayon, further in view of Admitted Prior Art (under MPEP §2144.03 C). Claims 27, 30 and 34 have been canceled, rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Claims 26, 28-29, 31-33 and 35-36 depend from amended claim 21 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 21. The elements from claim 34 that have been incorporated into independent claim 21 include a media file history log for integration into each media file that identifies at least one of previous owners and transfers of the media file and synchronization of the media file history log with the logged transfers stored within the central interface unit. None of the cited references disclose this limitation. Tadayon fails to disclose this element, as the clearinghouse of Tadayon is not equivalent to the media file history log that is integrated into each media file. Manifestly, if none of the references teach a claimed feature, as shown by addressing the references individually, then the combination of references will also not contain the claimed feature. *Ex Parte Orlofsky*, page 9, BPAI (2002). Therefore, the allowance of claims 26, 28-29, 31-33 and 35-38 is respectfully requested.

Claims 21-25 and 39-42 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herpel in view of Tadayon, further in view of TCP. As noted above, Claims 39 and 41-42 have been canceled, rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Independent claims 21, 22 and 40 have been amended to include the limitation of a integrating a media file history log into each media file that identifies at least one of previous owners and transfers of the media file, the media file being synchronized with the media file history log with the logged transfers stored within the central interface unit. None of the cited references disclose this limitation. Claims 23-25 depend from

amended claim 21 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 21. Therefore, the allowance of claims 21-25 and 40 is respectfully requested.

Claims 26-38 stand alternatively rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Herpel in view of Tadayon, further in view of Admitted Prior Art, further in view of TCP. As noted above, claims 27, 30 and 34 have been canceled, rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Independent claim 21 has been amended to include the limitation of integrating a media file history log into each media file that identifies at least one of previous owners and transfers of the media file, the media file being synchronized with the media file history log with the logged transfers stored within the central interface unit. None of the cited references disclose this limitation. Claims 26, 28-29, 31-33 and 35-38 depend from amended claim 21 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 21. Therefore, the allowance of claims 26, 28-29, 31-33 and 35-38 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael Cameron Reg. No. 50,298/

Michael G. Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Date: August 16, 2010

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(214) 532-9857
michael.cameron@ericsson.com